



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/056,596

01/24/2002

David Collier

GE - 120432

4700

7590

10/02/2009

John S. Beulick  
Armstrong Teasdale LLP  
One Metropolitan Sq., Suite 2600  
St. Louis, MO 63102

EXAMINER

GOLD, AVI M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2457

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/02/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/056,596	<b>Applicant(s)</b> COLLIER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> AVI GOLD	<b>Art Unit</b> 2457	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-10,12-22,24-36 and 38-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-10,12-22,24-36 and 38-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is responsive to the amendment filed on September 9, 2009. Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 13, 15-18, 20, 22, 24, 28-33, 36, 39, and 42 were amended. Claim 46 is newly added. Claims 3, 11, 23, and 37 have been canceled. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-22, 24-36, and 38-46 are pending.

### ***Response to Amendment***

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-22, 24-36, and 38-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curtis, U.S. Patent No. 6,668,279, in view of Pettersen, U.S. Patent No. 6,826,594, further in view of Papadopoulos et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,061,603.

Curtis teaches the invention substantially as claimed including methods and apparatus for enabling a web server to transport data to an in-kernel HTTP cache (see abstract).

As to claim 1, Curtis teaches a web-enabled automation control module (ACM) comprising:

an ACM central processing unit (CPU) (col. 6, lines 1-10, Curtis discloses a CPU used in HTTP transport acceleration);

an ACM CPU system memory electrically connected to said ACM CPU (col. 10, lines 35-49); and

a web and file transfer system directly electrically connected, without using a backplane, to said ACM CPU, said web and file transfer system embedded within said ACM, said web and file transfer system comprising a web server, a file transfer server, and a database, said web and file transfer system configured to (col. 2, lines 54-65, Curtis discloses a request and response HTTP data transport; col. 4, lines 39-48, Curtis discloses a web server receiving and processing HTTP requests; col. 10, lines 59-65, Curtis discloses the CPU being connected to input/output devices; col. 1, lines 21-36, Curtis discloses a web server used to access a web page):

receive from a network a plurality of web page files, at least one of the plurality of web page files comprising at least one ACM tag function that facilitates an exchange of ACM data between said web server and said ACM CPU system memory (col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 2, lines 54-65, col. 6, lines 1-28);

store the plurality of user-defined web page files in said database (col. 1, lines 21-36);

receive, from the network, a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) request to send a first web page file of the plurality of web page files to the network (col. 1, lines 21-36);

process the HTTP request (col. 1, lines 21-36);

access the web page file referenced in the HTTP request (col. 1, lines 21-36);

Curtis fails to teach the limitation further including the use of a user-defined web file.

However, Pettersen teaches systems and methods for dynamic construction of a web page via electronic links over a global electronic network, such as the Internet (see abstract). Pettersen teaches the use of a user creating their own web page and embedding their generated dynamic code in additional, but different, web pages (col. 10, lines 6-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Curtis in view of Pettersen to use user-defined web pages. One would be motivated to do so because it allows for dynamic customized web sites.

Curtis also fails to teach the limitation further including parsing the web page file for the at least one ACM tag function; and executing the at least one ACM tag function using form data from the HTTP request to transmit ACM data to said ACM CPU to control operation of said ACM, wherein ACM is one of a programmable logic controller (PLC), a computer numeric control (CNC), and a motion control product.

However, Papadopoulos teaches a system for coupling a network of programmable controllers through an internet work to a monitoring and control device (see abstract). Papadopoulos teaches parsing an HTTP request (col. 8, lines 30-46), interacting with choices on a web page to control operation of an ACM (col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 39) and the use of ACMs that are PLCs (col. 2, lines 30-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Curtis in view of Papadopoulos to parse the web page file for the at

least one ACM tag function; and execute the at least one ACM tag function using form data from the HTTP request to transmit ACM data to said ACM CPU to control operation of said ACM, wherein ACM is one of a programmable logic controller (PLC), a computer numeric control (CNC), and a motion control product. One would be motivated to do so because it allows an efficient way to control devices connected to the CPU and for the automation of a factory.

Regarding claim 2, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 1 wherein said web server is electrically connected to said ACM CPU and the network, said web server configured to receive the HTTP request from the network and to process the HTTP request from the network (col. 4, lines 39-48, Curtis discloses a web server receiving and processing HTTP requests).

Regarding claim 4, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 2 wherein said web server configured to respond to the HTTP request from the network by one of transmitting the first web page file to the network or transferring ACM data to the ACM CPU using form data from the HTTP request (col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 4, lines 39-48, Curtis discloses a web server responding to HTTP requests).

Regarding claim 5, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 1 wherein said database electrically connected to said web server, said web server configured to read the first user-defined web page file from said database (col. 1, lines 21-36).

Regarding claim 6, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 1 wherein said web server configured to receive ACM data from said ACM CPU (col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 4, lines 39-48).

Regarding claim 7, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 1 wherein said web server configured to receive ACM data to said ACM CPU (col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 4, lines 39-48).

Regarding claim 8, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 6 wherein said web server configured to receive ACM data from the received ACM CPU and embed the received ACM data within said the first user-defined web page file based on function tags embedded within said the first user-defined web page file (Curtis, col. 1, lines 21-36, Pettersen, col. 10, lines 6-50).

Regarding claim 9, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 1 wherein said web server configured to send the first user-defined web page file through the network using HTTP (Curtis, col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 4, lines 39-48, Pettersen, col. 10, lines 6-50).

Regarding claim 10, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 1 wherein said web and file transfer system further comprises a network interface configured for connection to the network (col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 4, lines 39-48).

Regarding claim 12, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 1 wherein said ACM comprises a backplane interface electrically connected to said ACM and a ACM backplane electrically connected to said backplane interface, said ACM backplane configured for connection with at least one of an input/output (I/O) module and an input module (col. 10, lines 59-65, Curtis discloses the CPU being connected to input/output devices; Papadopoulos, col. 5, lines 25-33).

Regarding claim 13, Curtis teaches an automation control module (ACM) system comprising: a network; a web-enabled computer electrically connected to said network; and an ACM electrically connected to said web-enabled computer via said network, wherein said ACM is comprising an ACM central processing unit (CPU) directly electrically connected to a web and file transfer without using a backplane, said ACM CPU and said web and file transfer subsystem embedded within said ACM, said web and file transfer subsystem comprising a web server, a file transfer server, and a database, said subsystem configured to store at least one user-defined web page file in said database (col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 2, lines 54-65, col. 4, lines 39-48, col. 6, lines 1-10, col. 10, lines 59-65) ;



received from said web-enabled computer, via said network a plurality of user-defined web page files, at least one of said plurality of web page files comprising at least one ACM tag function that facilitates an exchange of ACM data between said web and file transfer subsystem and said ACM CPU (col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 2, lines 54-65, col. 6, lines 1-28);

store the plurality of user-defined web page files in said database (col. 1, lines 21-36);

receive, from the network, a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) request to send a first web page file of the plurality of web page files to the network (col. 1, lines 21-36);

process the HTTP request (col. 1, lines 21-36);

access the web page file referenced in the HTTP request (col. 1, lines 21-36).

Curtis fails to teach the limitation further including the use of a user-defined web file with tag functions.

However, Pettersen teaches the use of a user creating their own web page and embedding their generated dynamic code in additional, but different, web pages (col. 10, lines 6-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Curtis in view of Pettersen to use user-defined web pages with tag functions. One would be motivated to do so because it allows for dynamic customized web sites.

Curtis also fails to teach the limitation further including parsing the web page file for the at least one ACM tag function; and executing the at least one ACM tag function

using form data from the HTTP request to transmit ACM data to said ACM CPU to control operation of said ACM, wherein ACM is one of a programmable logic controller (PLC), a computer numeric control (CNC), and a motion control product.

However, Papadopoulos teaches parsing an HTTP request (col. 8, lines 30-46), interacting with choices on a web page to control operation of an ACM (col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 39) and the use of ACMs that are PLCs (col. 2, lines 30-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Curtis in view of Papadopoulos to parse the web page file for the at least one ACM tag function; and execute the at least one ACM tag function using form data from the HTTP request to transmit ACM data to said ACM CPU to control operation of said ACM, wherein ACM is one of a programmable logic controller (PLC), a computer numeric control (CNC), and a motion control product. One would be motivated to do so because it allows an efficient way to control devices connected to the CPU and for the automation of a factory.

Regarding claim 14, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 13 wherein a database is electrically connected to said network and said file transfer server (col. 2, lines 54-65).

Regarding claim 15, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 14 wherein said file transfer server is configured to read and write to the plurality of user-

Art Unit: 2457

defined web page files stored in said database (Curtis, col. 1, lines 21-36, Pettersen, col. 10, lines 6-50).

Regarding claim 16, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 13 wherein said file transfer server configured to transfer the plurality of user-defined web-page files through said network to said computer (Curtis, col. 1, lines 21-36, Pettersen, col. 10, lines 6-50).

As to claim 17, Pettersen teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 13 wherein said file transfer server configured to allow a user to at least one of create the plurality of user-defined web page files and modify the plurality of user-defined web page files (Curtis, col. 1, lines 21-36, Pettersen, col. 10, lines 6-50).

Regarding claim 18, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 13 wherein at least one of the plurality of user-defined web page files comprises at least one of hypertext markup language (HTML), Javascript, and references to other files (col. 1, lines 21-36).

Regarding claim 19, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 18 wherein said references to other files comprise at least one of at least one image file and at least one Applet (col. 1, lines 21-36).

Regarding claim 20, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 13 wherein said at least one the plurality of user-defined web page files comprises at least one ACM tag function (Curtis, col. 1, lines 21-36, Pettersen, col. 10, lines 6-50).

Regarding claim 21, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 13 wherein said file transfer server is a file transfer protocol server (col. 2, lines 54-65).

Regarding claim 22, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 13 wherein said web and file transfer subsystem further comprises a network interface electrically connected to said file transfer server and said network (col. 4, lines 39-48).

Regarding claim 24, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 13 configured to display at least one of the plurality of user-defined web page files on said computer (Curtis, col. 1, lines 21-36, Pettersen, col. 10, lines 6-50).

Regarding claim 25, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 13 wherein a user is required to enter a valid user name and user password to access said ACM system (col. 2, lines 54-65).

Regarding claim 26, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 25 wherein said user configures the number of web and file transfer TCP connections using said computer (col. 2, lines 54-65).

Regarding claim 27, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 26 further configured to disable said web and file transfer TCP connections when said user configures zero of said web and file transfer TCP connections (col. 2, lines 54-65).

Regarding claim 28, Curtis teaches a method for management and control of an automation control module (ACM) including an ACM central processing unit (CPU):

embedding a web and file transfer system within the ACM including electrically connecting the web and file transfer system directly to the ACM CPU without the use of a backplane, the web and file transfer system includes a web server, a file transfer server, and a database configured to store at least one web page file (col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 2, lines 54-65, col. 4, lines 39-48, col. 6, lines 1-10, col. 10, lines 59-65);

electrically connecting the web and file transfer system to a network (col. 4, lines 39-48); and

processing a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) request message from the network using the web and file transfer system, the HTTP request message comprising a request to send the web page file to the network (col. 4, lines 39-48).

Curtis fails to teach the limitation further including the use of a user-defined web file.

However, Pettersen teaches systems and methods for dynamic construction of a web page via electronic links over a global electronic network, such as the Internet (see abstract). Pettersen teaches the use of a user creating their own web page and

Art Unit: 2457

embedding their generated dynamic code in additional, but different, web pages (col. 10, lines 6-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Curtis in view of Pettersen to use user-defined web pages. One would be motivated to do so because it allows for dynamic customized web sites.

Curtis also fails to teach the limitation further including using form data from the HTTP requests to transfer ACM data to said ACM CPU to control operation of said ACM, wherein ACM is one of a programmable logic controller (PLC), a computer numeric control (CNC), and a motion control product.

However, Papadopoulos teaches the use of interacting with choices on a web page to control operation of an ACM (col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 39) and teaches the use of ACMs that are PLCs (col. 2, lines 30-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Curtis in view of Papadopoulos to use form data from the HTTP requests to transfer ACM data to said ACM CPU to control operation of said ACM, wherein ACM is one of a programmable logic controller (PLC), a computer numeric control (CNC), and a motion control product. One would be motivated to do so because it allows an efficient way to control devices connected to the CPU and for the automation of a factory.

Regarding claim 29, Curtis teaches a method in accordance with claim 28 wherein the web server is electronically connected to the ACM CPU and the network,

processing the HTTP request message from the network using the web and file transfer system comprises processing the HTTP request message from the network using the web server (col. 2, lines 54-65, col. 4, lines 39-48, col. 6, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 30, Curtis teaches a method in accordance with claim 29 wherein processing the HTTP request message from the network using the web server comprises: receiving the HTTP request message from the network using the web server; and responding to the HTTP request message using the web server (col. 4, lines 39-48).

Regarding claim 31, Curtis teaches a method in accordance with claim 29 wherein the database is electrically connected to the web server processing the HTTP request message from the network using the web server comprises: receiving the HTTP request message from the network; reading the web page file from the database, the web page file referenced in the HTTP request message; requesting ACM data from the ACM CPU via function tags embedded within the web page file; receiving the ACM data from the ACM CPU; embedding the ACM data within the web page file; and sending the web page file through the network (col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 2, lines 54-65, col. 4, lines 39-48, col. 6, lines 1-10, Petersen, col. 10, lines 6-50).

Regarding claim 32, Curtis teaches a method in accordance with claim 29 wherein processing the HTTP request message from the network using the web server

comprises transferring ACM data to the ACM CPU using the web server as directed by function tags embedded within at least one web page file and by form data contained in the HTTP request message (col. 1, lines 21-36, Petersen, col. 10, lines 6-50).

Regarding claim 33, Pettersen teaches a method in accordance with claim 28 wherein the file transfer server electrically connected to the database and the network, said method further comprising: storing the user-defined web page file in the database; reading the user-defined web page file using the file transfer server and the network; and writing to the user-defined web page file using the file transfer server and the network (Petersen, col. 10, lines 6-50).

Regarding claim 34, Curtis teaches a method in accordance with claim 31 wherein the database includes at least one user name and at least one user password, the network includes at least one computer electrically connected to the network, said method further comprising requiring a user input a valid user name and valid user password into the computer to access the web and file transfer system (col. 2, lines 54-65).

Regarding claim 35, Curtis teaches a method in accordance with claim 34 further comprising;

allowing a user to configure the number of web and file transfer TCP connections using the computer; and



disabling the web and file transfer TCP connections when the user configures zero of the web and file transfer TCP connections (col. 2, lines 54-65).

Regarding claim 36, Curtis teaches a method for management and control of an automation control module (ACM) using an ACM system, the ACM system including an ACM, a network, a web-enabled computer electrically connected the network, and the ACM electrically connected to the web-enabled computer via the network, the ACM comprising an ACM central processing unit (CPU), said method comprising:

embedding a web and file transfer subsystem within the ACM including directly electrically connecting the web and file transfer subsystem to the ACM CPU without the use of a backplane, the web and file transfer subsystem includes a web server, a file transfer server, and a database (col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 2, lines 54-65, col. 4, lines 39-48, col. 6, lines 1-10, col. 10, lines 59-65);

storing at least web page file in the database, the at least one web page file comprising at least one ACM tag function that facilitates an exchange of ACM data between the web and file transfer subsystem and the ACM CPU (col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 2, lines 54-65, col. 6, lines 1-10) ; and

processing a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) request from the network (col. 1, lines 21-36);

Curtis fails to teach the limitation further including the use of a user-defined web page.

However, Pettersen teaches the use of a user creating their own web page and embedding their generated dynamic code in additional, but different, web pages (col. 10, lines 6-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Curtis in view of Pettersen to use user-defined web pages. One would be motivated to do so because it allows for dynamic customized web sites.

Curtis also fails to teach the limitation further including executing the at least one ACM tag function using form data from the HTTP request to transfer ACM data to said ACM to control operation of said ACM, wherein ACM is one of a programmable logic controller (PLC), a computer numeric control (CNC), and a motion control product.

However, Papadopoulos teaches the use of interacting with choices on a web page to control operation of an ACM (col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 39) and teaches the use of ACMs that are PLCs (col. 2, lines 30-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Curtis in view of Papadopoulos to execute the at least one ACM tag function using form data from the HTTP request to transfer ACM data to said ACM to control operation of said ACM, wherein ACM is one of a programmable logic controller (PLC), a computer numeric control (CNC), and a motion control product. One would be motivated to do so because it allows an efficient way to control devices connected to the CPU and for the automation of a factory.

Regarding claim 38, Pettersen teaches a method in accordance with claim 36 further comprising: reading the at least one user-defined web page file stored in the database using the file transfer server; and writing to the at least one user-defined web page file stored in the database using the file transfer server (col. 10, lines 6-50).

Regarding claim 39, Pettersen teaches a method in accordance with claim 38 wherein reading the at least one user-defined web page file stored in the database using the file transfer server further comprising: transferring the at least one user-defined web page file to the computer; and displaying the at least one user-defined web page file on the computer using the file transfer server (col. 10, lines 6-50).

Regarding claim 40, Pettersen teaches a method in accordance with claim 38 wherein writing to the at least one user-defined web page file stored in the database using the file transfer server comprises allowing a user to modify the at least one user-defined web page file using the computer and the file transfer server (col. 10, lines 6-50).

Regarding claim 41, Pettersen teaches a method in accordance with claim 36 further comprising allowing a user to create a user-defined web page file using the computer and the file transfer server (col. 10, lines 6-50).

Regarding claim 42, Curtis teaches a method in accordance with claim 36 wherein processing the HTTP request from the computer using the web server (col. 4, lines 39-48).

Regarding claim 43, Curtis teaches a method in accordance with claim 36 wherein the database includes at least one user name and at least one user password, said method further comprising requiring a user input a valid user name and valid user password into the computer to access the web and file transfer subsystem (col. 2, lines 54-65).

Regarding claim 44, Curtis teaches a method in accordance with claim 43 further comprising; allowing a user to configure the number of web and file transfer TCP connections using the computer; and disabling the web and file transfer TCP connections when the user configures zero of the web and file transfer TCP connections (col. 2, lines 54-65).

Regarding claim 45, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 1 wherein said ACM is in operational control communication with a device (col. 10, lines 59-65).

Regarding claim 46, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 1, wherein said web server is configured to:

request ACM data from said ACM CPU based on parsing the web page file for tag functions and applying form data from the HTTP request;

receive ACM data from said ACM CPU;

embed the received ACM data within at least one web page file; and

send the at least one web page file to the network (Curtis, col. 1, lines 21-36; Papadopoulos, col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 39; Pettersen, col. 10, lines 6-50).

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-22, 24-36, and 38-46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

4. The Examiner recommends that Applicant thoroughly review the Papadopoulos et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,061,603), Williamson (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0083770), Nordquist et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0014160), and Borders et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,004,402) references, in comparison to the specification of the current application, prior to amending the claims.

### ***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,598,083 to Remer et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,629,127 to Deen et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,684,257 to Camut et al.

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0083770 to Williamson, because it discloses a web page used to control a device.

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0014160 to Nordquist et al., because it discloses a web page used for controlling a device.

U.S. Patent No. 7,004,402 to Borders et al., because it discloses using security measures to access a web site to then be able to control a device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AVI GOLD whose telephone number is (571)272-4002. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/056,596  
Art Unit: 2457

Page 22

/A. G./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2457

/ARIO ETIENNE/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457